

REMARKS

Teleconference With Examiner

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his time during the teleconference between the Examiner and the undersigned on February 9, 2007 discussing the pending Office Action. This response is being filed in accordance with that teleconference.

During the teleconference, the undersigned pointed out to the Examiner that the §§102 and 103 rejections in the November 14, 2006 Office Action do not appear to address the amendments made by Applicant on October 25, 2006 in Amendment E (e.g. the rejection of Claim 2 does not address the amended feature of at least four data lines). Upon review of the amended claims and the rejections, the Examiner agreed and believed that he was working with an old, outdated version of the claims.

The Examiner then advised the undersigned that Applicant should file a response to the Office Action and remind the Examiner that the undersigned and he spoke and that he had reviewed the wrong claims when making his rejections. The Examiner then agreed to respond with a new examination of the pending claims. Applicant is including their prior arguments below for the Examiner's consideration.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner use the enclosed claims during his examination and issue a new Office Action or Notice of Allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Final Rejection (and currently), the Examiner rejects Claim 2 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 5,805,128). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, in the prior amendment, Applicant changed “two data lines” to “four data lines” in Claim 2. This feature is supported by, for example, at least Figs. 2A and 5 of the present application.¹

It is respectfully submitted that Kim clearly does not disclose or suggest “at least four data lines extend in each one of the pixel columns”, and “the at least four data lines are connected to different data drivers,” as in independent Claim 2. At most, it could be contended that Kim shows two data lines.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner now consider amended independent Claim 2. Claim 2 is not disclosed or suggested by Kim and is patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejected and still rejects Claims 3 and 10 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 2002/0044124). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, in the prior amendment, Applicant amended Claim 3 to make it independent.

As the Examiner admits, Kim does not disclose the pixels having a light emitting element, as recited in Claim 3. The Examiner, however, cites Yamazaki as disclosing an LED

¹ Applicant also deleted the language “so as to simultaneously supply video signals to the pixels through the at least two data lines” and including this feature (for the amended at least four data lines) in a new dependent Claim 35.

region and contends that it would have been obvious to utilize the LED taught by Yamazaki in the liquid crystal display disclosed by Kim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

More specifically, in this rejection, the Examiner states “Yamazaki et al. teach the LED region which is overlapped with a gate insulating film interposing the gate insulating film is called L.sub.ov region. The LDD region which is not overlapped with the gate insulating film is called L.sub.off region (paragraph 0174).” (emphasis in original). Initially, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s argument and point are not clear, and a further explanation and further details are requested.

In addition, Applicants believe that “the LED region in Yamazaki” seems to be incorrect and should be the “LDD region” based on paragraphs [0171] to [0179] in Yamazaki which appear to describe a doping process for forming a TFT.

Further, Applicants have checked the Japanese original documents of Yamazaki, i.e., JP2000-168203 and JP-2000-168241. The following is a literal translation of the paragraph in the two Japanese original documents corresponding to [0174] of Yamazaki (i.e. 2002/0044124); “In this specification, the LDD region which is overlapped with a gate electrode with the gate insulating film therebetween is called Lov region. The LDD region which is not overlapped with the gate electrode is called Loff region” (emphasis added). Thus, Applicants believe that “the LED region” in this section of Yamazaki is a translation error.

As further evidence, Applicants included with the prior amendment a copy of the publication of JP 2002-108243 which is domestic priority application of JP2000-168203 and JP2000-168241 (see front page of JP ‘243), and hence, also of Yamazaki (2002/0044124). Paragraph [0146] in col. 30 of JP ‘243 corresponds to [0174] in Yamazaki. [0146] clearly recites “LDD” in the first sentence, prior to Lov, and not “LED.” Hence, this is clearly a translation

error and its correct meaning removes the basis for the Examiner's rejection. Thus, the Examiner's argument is now moot. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider this document at this time.

If the Examiner should now contend that the EL element 204 in Fig. 5 of Yamazaki corresponds to the light-emitting element of the claimed invention, the Examiner needs to set forth a new suggestion or motivation to combine the liquid crystal display device of Kim and the EL element 204 of Yamazaki, since the LDD region of Yamazaki does not necessarily require the EL element 204.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither cited reference discloses or suggests the device of independent Claim 3 of the present application. Accordingly, independent Claim 3 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Allowance and Amendment of Claims

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of Claims 4-9 and 11-34. Applicant is amending Claims 4, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 23-25, 29, 32-34, 36 and 37 to correct informalities therein, such as grammatical and spelling errors and inconsistencies between the independent claim and the dependent claim. For example, "a same" has been changed to "the same;" a vide signal" has been changed to "a video signal;" "extend" has been changed to "extending;" etc. No new matter is being added, and these amendments do not affect the allowability of these claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new dependent Claims 38-40. If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is also submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered at this time and prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee is due for this amendment or IDS, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 13, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568